

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLC

55 WEST MONROE STREET  
SUITE 1111  
CHICAGO, IL 60603  
WWW.WHAFH.COM

TELEPHONE 312-984-0000  
FAX 312-984-0001

270 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10016  
212-545-4600\*

SYMPHONY TOWERS  
750 B STREET - SUITE 2770  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
619-239-4599\*

625 NORTH FLAGLER DRIVE  
9TH FLOOR  
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401  
561-833-1776\*

ADAM J. LEVITT  
e-mail: levitt@whafh.com

May 22, 2006

**VIA .PDF EMAIL AND TELECOPY**

Michael P. Lehmann, Esq.  
The Furth Firm LLP  
225 Bush Street, Fifteenth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94104

Michael Hausfeld, Esq.  
Cohen Milstein Hausfeld & Toll  
1100 New York Ave., N.W.  
West Tower, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005

Guido Saveri, Esq.  
Saveri & Saveri, Inc.  
111 Pine Street, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, California 94111

Anthony D. Shapiro, Esq.  
Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro, LLP  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, Washington 98101

**Re: *In re Intel Corporation Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation***  
**MDL Docket No. 05-MD-1717 JJF**  
**Civil Action No.: 1:05-CV-00485 JJF (D. Del.)**

Dear Counsel,

At almost 9:00 pm (EDT) this past Friday evening, Interim Class Counsel sent its proposed "First Amended Consolidated Complaint" (the "Proposed Amended Complaint") to us, requesting that we forward our comments to you "preferably over the weekend," because Interim Class Counsel intended to file the Proposed Amended Complaint on Monday

Although your communication arrived after weekend began, we have had an opportunity to review it. It does not solve the issues which we described to you in some detail in our earlier correspondence on this matter. In particular, we had a conference call with you relating to these very issues more than eight days earlier – on the very last day that the Court provided for us to solve these issues prior to the commencement of your time to respond to our clients' motion. At your

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLC

May 22, 2006  
Page 2 of 2


request and invitation, we sent a follow-up letter to you the following day again explaining our concerns with Interim Class Counsel's Consolidated Complaint and the perceived flaws therein, and setting forth language that we believe addresses many of the National Plaintiffs Group's concerns with respect thereto.

While we have not had a chance to exhaustively compare your Proposed Amended Complaint with your initial Consolidated Complaint or each of our suggested revisions thereto, it appears, from our review, that Interim Class Counsel has taken none of the steps nor has made any of the substantive revisions that we have repeatedly suggested to you. The Proposed Amended Complaint does not take any steps to deal with our concerns about the problems that we believe are endemic throughout your earlier pleadings in this case. Moreover you have failed to include our clients in your Proposed Amended Complaint, thereby recognizing their right to proceed as class representatives for their claims with counsel of their choice

In sum, we do not authorize you to seek leave to file -- or otherwise file -- the Proposed Amended Complaint on our clients' behalf, as it does not protect their interests or the interests of the class(es) -- both of which you are obligated to do as Interim Class Counsel under Rule 23(g).

In light of the fact that Interim Class Counsel is clearly unwilling to protect our clients' claims and interests in this litigation, we await your opposition to The National Plaintiffs Group's Motion for Leave to File Their Consolidated Complaint, which, by our calculation, is due on or before Friday, May 26, 2006.

Sincerely,



Adam J. Levitt

cc: Frederick L. Cottrell, Esq. (via .pdf email)  
Charles P. Diamond, Esq. (via .pdf email)  
Richard L. Horowitz, Esq. (via .pdf email)  
Christopher B. Hockett, Esq. (via .pdf email)  
Fred Taylor Isquith, Esq. (via .pdf email)  
Francis A. Bottini, Jr., Esq. (via .pdf email)